DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 549 HE 000 247

By-Palola, Ernest G.

Changing Centers of Power in Higher Education. A Challenge to Institutional Leadership.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Pub Date 21 Jun 68

Note-53p.; Paper prepared for the Junior College Presidents Seminar, Berkeley, California, June 21, 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75

Descriptors-*Educational Objectives, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, *Leadership Responsibility, *Legislation, *Organizational Climate, Power Structure, Social Change

The fundamental character of US colleges and universities is being changed by a variety of forces and pressures which have created a period of confusion, uncertainty, and alarm for many educators and policy-makers in higher education. The traditional principles and modes of institutional leadership are being challenged by forces from within and without higher education institutions. These forces often conflict with each other in struggles for power which negate simple solutions, but at the same time they contribute to major shifts in the distribution of power, authority, and influence in higher education. The demands for change must be met by new strategies which stimulate more interest in the purposes and goals of higher education institutions in order to reduce uncertainty about the institutions' contribution to society as they seek to maintain organizational flexibility to meet new and changing circumstances. The paper discusses: (1) the features of 3 major crises in higher education since World War II, (2) a theoretical framework designed to focus on the distribution of authority and influence in higher education, (3) conceptual issues concerning national and statewide scenes within the context of the theoretical framework, and (4) the consequences of changing centers of power and authority for institutional leadership, and a renewed identity for colleges and universities within an open, flexible system of authority. (WM)

ED029549

CHANGING CENTERS OF POWER IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A CHALLENGE TO INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Ernest G. Palola
Research Sociologist

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

University of California
Berkeley, California

Paper prepared for the Junior College Presidents Seminar,
June 21, 1968, Berkeley, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 247

CHANGING CENTERS OF POWER IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

A CHALLENGE TO INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Introduction

Today American higher education is faced by a wide variety of significant forces and pressures which are changing the fundamental character of colleges and universities. Student uprisings over the Viet Nam War, the conditions of poverty and racial tensions in the urban setting, the growing claim for full participation by students in academic governance and the marked increase of unionism among faculty are the more visible points of tensions. In some cases tensions are transformed into open conflicts between students and local campus authorities. New issues are created about the jurisdictional rights and responsibilities of civil and campus authorities. The traditional boundaries between internal campus affairs and broader community interests are fading. Growth of faculty unionism although less apparent to the general public is becoming a significant movement on many college campuses. This is causing a separation between faculty and administrators as well as cleavages among segments of faculty who hold allegiance to different union or quasi-union organizations.

Other important forces are at work in the superstructure of higher education. These include the rapidly growing financial problem which legislatures face and their increasing concern about campus disturbances; the continued growth and expansion of responsibilities of statewide coordinating agencies; and the mushrooming commitment of the federal government to the financing of higher education and to the reshaping of statewide systems in response to national problems and issues. These multiple forces have created a period of confusion, uncertainty, and alarm for many educators and policy-makers in higher education. Traditional principles and modes of institutional leadership are being challenged.

The several new forces within colleges and universities plus those impinging on campuses from outside often conflict with each other and definitely create "a cause for concern" about the routinized and established procedures of institutions. The resulting struggles for power negate simple solutions. No easy reconciliation can be designed nor implemented to bring order out of chaos and conflict. This period also marks an important era in higher education because it provides an opportunity to exert leadership and a chance to carve out a new sense of order and direction for the affairs of higher education. Aims and purposes are being challenged and changes are mandatory. However, the quality of change depends highly on the quality of leadership exercized by educators and students. John Gardner suggests the type of change required to meet the several challenges that colleges and universities face when he states:

> ...much of the change from scientific and technological advances has unintended consequences for social institutions. We do not need more change as such. We need more <u>intentional</u> change - specifically, the kinds of change in our institutions that will enable them to adapt to the radically altered circumstances in which they are now forced to function.[1]

The remainder of this paper is organized into four major sections: first, the features of three major crises in higher education since World War II are outlined; second, a theoretical framework is offered which focuses on the distribution of authority and influence in higher education, highlights certain distinctions useful in the explication of authority and which links distribution of authority to the exercise of institutional leadership; third, conceptual issues dealing with the national and statewide scenes are discussed within the context of the framework developed; and fourth, the consequences of changing centers of authority and power for institutional leadership are discussed, and alter-

native approaches are suggested as to how colleges and universities might construct a renewed identity and integrity within an open and flexible system of authority.

Three Major Crises in Higher Education

A more detailed examination of the events from World War II to the present suggests three substantively different but overlapping "crises" that have confronted higher education. Subsequent to World War II and the post-Sputnik decade the primary challenge for education was the new commitment to universal higher education.[2] No longer was access to education beyond high school restricted to a rather well-defined and circumscribed stratum of the populace, but an "open door" policy was to characterize access into some type of higher education for all qualified students. This meant, obviously, a vast expansion of student enrollments. New institutions were constructed and existing ones were forced to expand their capacities manifold. Many educators were uneasy about the rate and scope of this expansion. Little serious thought or debate was possible regarding the long-range impact of this expansion on existing programs and methods of instruction. Nevertheless, these expansions occurred, multiversities emerged, and the junior college movement was significantly accelerated. In fact, the growth of new junior colleges continues today at the rate of some 50 new campuses per year.[3]

This period, then, of rapid growth and development which began in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and which still persists today, although the rate of expansion is less, can be referred to as the "quantitative crisis" in higher education. In the early 1960's it became evident that local and state monies would not be sufficient to meet the new demands associated with the rapid expansions that were underway. And, in 1963 the federal government support of

higher education was significantly expanded to provide financial assistance for the construction of facilities. Similarly the 1965 State Technical Services Act brought new monies to states. Also in 1965, the Higher Education Act further extended and reinforced the Federal government's support of higher education. New structures were needed at the state level to administer these programs. During the 1960's, forty-two percent (18/43) of the existing statewide coordinating agencies were created. In most cases these agencies are responsible for the administration of many federally sponsored programs in higher education.

Although we have not seen in any sense the full magnitude of federal involvement in higher education, the increases observed thus far and the emergence of statewide coordinating agencies has stimulated many observers to ask fundamental questions about the possible dangers and likely issues associated with these movements. Logan Wilson, for one, asks:

> Will the states' increasing use of statewide governing or coordinating bodies result in a more rational approach to our growing problems of support and control? In what undesirable ways does it weaken the autonomy of individual institutions? Does it tend to politicize what ought to be professional decisions?
>
> Is the Federal government itself organized in such a way as to perceive and come to grips with the problems of higher education? To what extent does the Federal government's enlarged role in supporting higher education inevitably entail its greater participation in planning, directing, and conducting the total enterprise?
>
> And finally, within a state, a region, or the nation, what kinds of decisions are best made by centralized authority and what kinds by localized authority?[4]

Although the "quantitative crisis" has diminished somewhat, we are on the threshold of a new crisis. This crisis involves the dramatic increase in demands made on state and local treasuries for the support of higher education. Many

people think higher education is already in the midst of a "fiscal crisis." However, their image is based on seeing only the top of the proverbial iceberg... nine-tenths of which is still submerged. State appropriations for higher education continue to grow at fantastic rates. This creates additional agitation within higher education and state capitol hallways. Very serious and fundamental questions are just beginning to be raised about the priority for support to higher education in comparison to other state services and programs which are also expanding at a phenomenal rate. Governors and legislators are demanding more information and justification for higher education budgets. Program budgeting (about which more will be said later) is seen by many as one tool which may be used to establish greater rationality and a clearer sense of priority among competing demands for state financial support. It seems that the extent of the fiscal crisis was not foreseen in its full magnitude when the commitment to universal higher education was made after World War II. However, the implications of this commitment now squarely stand before all of us in higher education as well as local, state, and national governments.

The third crisis in higher education reflects a substantively different class of pressures impinging on colleges and universities. The potential impact of these pressures may likely result in more fundamental changes in higher education than any of the other forces mentioned. I refer here to a growing concern about the basic aims and purposes of higher education presently espoused in junior colleges, state colleges, or universities. And related to this issue is the question of organizational forms and teaching/learning processes appropriate to institutions with different objectives or goals. This crisis might be labeled the "qualitative crisis" in higher education. Stated in another way, one could describe the laxity of educators to cope with educational purposes

and aims as "goal evasion" in higher education. Early in our research on long-range planning we observed that planning seldom examines basic issues of educational policy but instead focuses on campus size, the number of campuses, cost of instruction, average class size, and the like. Statewide, segmental, and institutional planning is typically quantitative, routine, means-oriented, and concerned with logistics. For some time sociologists, in particular, have discussed the process of institutionalization, i.e., the development of patterned activities and modes of thought which reflect the crystalization and embodiment of particular values. If the mode of planning mentioned above becomes institutionalized, then the major task of defining the goals and objectives of education will be permanently evaded. Such a development would be inimical to the fundamental responsibilities of every institution. Furthermore, to the extent that institutions unquestionably accept the prevailing approach to planning and the system of categorizing organizational information, then they will perpetuate a scheme where primary emphasis is placed on quantity and efficiency, rather than quality and effectiveness. If this occurs, educational policy will be made by default rather than by active discussion and determination. We use the term goal evasion in our research to refer to the condition where little attention is given to the fundamental task of goal definition and its specification in operational terms. In addition to the growing uneasiness by some faculty and students with present conceptions of aims and purposes in higher education, the rate of social and technological change will likely modify substantially the entire function of higher education in society. Literature recently published about the year 2000 identifies many possibilities--more commuter institutions, an emphasis on problem-solving in teaching rather than the development of competence with specific bodies of information, individualization of instruction,

chemical transfer in learning, "university cities" characterized by a high degree of interrelatedness and interdependence of the university and urban institutions, increased mobility of faculty and students between institutions of higher education, life-long learning, laser holography to reproduce classrooms anywhere--which signal sharp reorientations in the accustomed ways of thinking about the process and organization of education. The drama of these futurities is captured in the following characterization.

> Scientists tend to agree that some of the most exciting future developments will come out of insights and discoveries yet to be made, with implications we cannot now foresee or imagine. So we live in an era where not only anything that we can imagine seems possible, but where the possibilities range beyond what we can imagine. In such an era, it is hard to tell physics from metaphysics, to distinguish the mad scientists from the real ones, to judge what is a true possibility and what is sheer rot. But there is no resolving this kind of uncertainty. Even the scientists cannot give us sure guidance of what is really going to happen.[5]

Students are increasingly concerned with such questions as: Will the college or university take an activist position and play a leadership role in the analysis, interpretation, and resolution of contemporary social problems, e.g., war, poverty, equal opportunity, racial integration? Will it be possible for students to play a more fundamental role in the determination of those aspects of college life that touch their central concerns most directly, e.g., curriculum teaching, due process under the law? Faculty, on the other hand, are raising different types of questions when they are not preoccupied with criticizing, supporting, or assisting in the adjudication of student problems and dilemmas. Many faculty share with students a concern about the relevance of teaching techniques and subject matter content to the new interest of students in the socio-politico-technological issues of contemporary society. But further, the

faculty members are confronted by other issues and problems. The overall economic and professional welfare of faculty has spiraled upward during the last decade. Opportunities for job mobility drastically increased within higher education along with a parallel opening of opportunities for many faculty in industry, business and government. Although this has resulted in significant improvements, the profile of economic returns to faculty still shows considerable variation across colleges and universities. Moreover, we can expect faculty to continue the battle for even better salaries and working conditions. The major area of competition between public and private institutions is faculty recruitment. Even though the public sector is expanding rapidly, there is less competition for students, programs, equipment and facilities. As one administrator expressed it, "The public institutions outbid us $2000.00 per man....But what's even more frustrating is that faculty can get such light teaching loads in the public institutions....We simply can't compete on these term:

Other issues press on the faculty today as well, but the rise of interest in faculty unions reflects, in part, the competitive economic market alluded to above. In addition, faculty desire more control over the general welfare of their profession and the conditions of work as defined by local campuses. The range of issues pertinent to faculty unionism--union recognition, collective bargaining, democratization of public higher education, and procedures in future budget preparation--are seen in last year's contract agreement for Chicago City College.[6]

We shall return to many of these trends and issues shortly. At this point, however, it is useful to specify some concepts and distinctions which will serve as a theoretical framework for the more intensive analysis that will follow.

Theoretical Framework

The research project I am presently directing is entitled, "Statewide Planning in Higher Education: Its Implications at the Institutional Level." The objectives of this study are to assess the contemporary effects of statewide planning, and to suggest guiding principles whereby the state needs for higher education can be met while at the same time preserving institutional autonomy. This involves developing a theoretical framework which suggests the most basic and fundamental decisions about higher education that must be made at the statewide, segmental, and institutional levels. Using this framework, comparisons are being made in four states--California, Florida, Illinois, and New York--to determine how certain decisions are handled and what apparent impact this is having on public and private institutions. Thus far, we have completed some 600 interviews with state officials, legislators, state coordinators for higher education, and faculty and administrators at eighty-one institutions (this includes 23 junior colleges and about 125 interviews). These data are now being analyzed and we anticipate our first research monograph to be written by this December.

Although the entire framework includes some five different concepts, the present discussion focuses on only two of these concepts--distribution of authority and influence institutional leadership--since they are most directly relevant to the examination of changing centers of power in higher education. The overall development of the framework is the result not simply of examining, studying, and synthesizing relevant theoretical literature but also reflects empirical sensitivities derived from our extensive field work in each of the four states included in the present investigation.

Distribution of Authority and Influence

We use the term authority in this paper as the legally accepted exercise of power to establish rules, make decisions, and enforce them among the constituent groups within institutions or statewide networks. This defines one formal basis used by contending groups to justify or legitimate their role in making decisions. The authority structure so established can either be rigidly interpreted in its more legalistic sense (i.e., strong rule oriented behavior and close surveillance and supervision of activities) or it can set forth broad "limits of permissivity" for each level and group within the network.[7] This latter option allows considerable latitude and flexibility within the authority structure. It also encourages adaptability and innovation as conditions change and new opportunities arise. However, such a degree of latitude also engenders a degree of risk-taking not easily accepted by a more procedure-centered and rule oriented administrator. Predictability of individual response under a variety of circumstances is less likely and thus an important degree of uncertainty may be introduced into the procedures and processes of organizational life.[8]

A different base for the legitimization of participation in making decisions is professional expertise. This principle embodies the amount and type of specialized knowledge and training possessed by individuals or by constituent groups within the network and to their ability to apply this knowledge in the decision-making process. In complex networks of formal organizations wide variations exist in the amount of knowledge, level of training, and the degree of ability among constituent parties. Furthermore, the distribution of professionals (faculty and administrators) across all levels of the legal-rational hierarchy in colleges, universities, and the larger higher education

system means that the decision-making process will be unusually complex in this regard when compared to other organizations (especially business and industry).[9] This unique organizational feature in educational institutions has required that careful attention be given to the patterns of participation in decision-making.[10] The recent claims by students for a more responsible role in academic governance has raised additional issues and has introduced one more element of complexity into the process of making decisions. Attempts to sort out the rights and responsibilities of the faculty and administrators raises some interesting problems. Lunsford recently wrote on certain dimensions of this issue stating that:

> Attempts to separate 'administrative' and 'academic' spheres of control also brings other problems...the special competence of the academic administrators is highly precarious and contingent. In the first place, there is no esoteric specialty of 'higher education' as an <u>activity</u> that academic men generally will acknowledge today, and in which university administrators might claim a trained and systematic 'competence' akin to that of an academic discipline. Second, no expertise in <u>governance</u> (or administration or management) is accepted by most academic men as a specialty that might undergird the special <u>functions</u> that administrators have come to perform. Thus university specialists in administration today cannot convincingly claim, <u>as a group</u>, any distinctive expertise which might clothe their bare, formal positions with 'professional' legitimacy. In the highly professionalized organization that is a university, this alone means that authority itself is always more or less precarious.[11]

Two other dimensions should be added to the principal of expertise. First, specialized knowledge can be classified by its time span. Some persons in key organization positions are oriented to and especially knowledgeable about contemporary affairs, issues, and special conditions, while other are concerned with long-range problems and futurities. Second, whether we focus on the contemporary situation or future possibilities, individuals vary as to the scope

or breadth of specialized knowledge they possess. Some faculty or administrators are very familiar with statewide developments and issues while others have a narrower set of interests and body of information. These distinctions and variations add important factors to the making of decisions in higher education. Institutions often claim to have the necessary expertise to justify an enlargement of their role in decision-making at the segment or statewide levels, when actually this knowledge is based upon day-to-day or short-range considerations.

In another context, Harold Wilensky discusses certain of the key issues underlying the collection and organization of data and information in organizations. Wilensky states that a fundamental problem exists regarding the way in which information is categorized and used within organizations and networks of organizations. That is, the categories we select significantly influence the way we perceive information and they set important limits on what courses of action are suggested by the information.[12] Just a brief pause to consider the variety of information that might be gathered by a statewide planning or coordinating board suggests the magnitude of the problem. Also, one might be led to consider the numerous pressures and vested interests along with the normal informational requirements of organizations that could determine what information is collected, how it is organized, and for what purposes it is used. Not to belabor the point, however, one could list such a range of information that might be used for statewide planning as: demography (enrollments, population trends); the educational services (stock and flow statistics, data on students, faculty, institutions, non-formal education); costs, finance and the economy; manpower and employment. Which of these four main types of data receives primary emphasis in planning becomes an extremely important issue given the constraints of resources, time, and data accessibility. It is very

difficult to influence critical decisions about campus or class size, faculty/student or student/counselor ratios, faculty travel expenses or total number of sabbatical leaves, and on, and on, when: 1) "good" data do not exist, 2) data exist but they have not been collected or systematically organized, or 3) subject evaluations and judgments receive low priority. When the Select Committee on Private Higher Education in New York recommends that state support be provided to private colleges and universities on the basis of quantitative factors alone (number of degrees awarded), it causes one to wonder about the quality of education and the ways in which the educational character of institutions may be affected in the long-run.[13] How has the locus of decision-making been affected by such a proposal? On what other bases might state monies be granted to campuses?

Finally, a third principle of decision-making focuses on the major informal basis for participation. The activities of vested interest groups (alumni, taxpayers' associations, accrediting agencies, professional associations, Chambers of Commerce, consulting firms) exert an important and oftentimes paramount influence which may operate both inside and outside the official authority structure of a network. There are many ways whereby students, faculty, administrators, and institutions or their segment boards can exert informal influence and significantly shape the decisions in a network. Furthermore, there are numerous groups located outside the network who watch closely the development of higher education and who often enter the decision process informally at critical junctures. For example, consider the variety of special interests represented by such groups as the California Junior College Association, American Federation of Teachers, Junior College Division of the California School Board Association, American Association of University Professors, and the like.

These different principles--authority, expertise, and vested interests--not only reflect different strategies used by the contending parties to influence the decision-making process but they often reflect conflicts over the values and goals of higher education.

The traditional decision-making process in higher education today is being challenged by various constituent groups who are seeking a larger voice in the statewide network. Such activities by these groups has increased the complexity of the decision-making process and created confusions and conflicts within the network. It is important, then, not only to recognize that decisions may be made on grounds of either formal or informal principles or a combination of these, but also to examine carefully the different roles that each group can play in the process of arriving at decisions. The following kinds of roles may be distinguished: initiating, reviewing, recommending, deciding, and implementing. The importance of these distinctions is recognized in the recent Report of the Study Commission on University Governance. At one point in this report it is stated that:

> It is possible, for example, to contemplate formal and informal structures in which students directly share the authority for final decisions; or an advisory role for students through joint or separate committees which prepare policy recommendations; or more autonomy for a separate student government; or realization of the opportunity to be heard before decisions are made, as when a proposed decision is announced and comment and reactions are invited before that decision is made final; or mechanisms for increased consultation so that student opinion can be fed into the decision-making machinery; or the indirect influence on policy-making which is a by-product of increased interaction between students and faculty or administration in the educational process. In its application, 'participation' may bring about changes which are either innocuous or radical, and the means proposed to effectuate the goals may range from general changes in the structure and process of education to highly particularized political arrangements.[14]

The recent statement in the AAUP Bulletin provides more substantive detail as to how these various roles can be performed by faculty. For example, it is suggested that a multiplicity of factors and dimensions permeate the several tasks performed by institutions and this fact necessitates the full opportunity for joint planning among governing boards, administration, faculty, students, and others. Also, certain issues require the initiating capacity and decision-making responsibility of all institutional participants, and differences in the weight each voice has should be set by reference to the responsibility each party has for the issue or matter at hand. And finally, it is argued that the faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those portions of student life which relate to the educational process.[15]

What this discussion of authority and influence suggests is that decision-making in higher education includes many subtleties and complicated distinctions Attempts to rationalize the decision-making process into a meaningful authority structure are very difficult. However, further explication of the dynamics involved should lead us to a better understanding.

Institutional Leadership

The primary problem that all institutions face is the definition of their distinctive mission and role. A second, but very closely related problem, is the necessity to continuously and consciously review and adapt their mission and role to new commitments. Institutional mission and role refers to the enunciation of the basic aims, purposes, or goals of an organization. Such a statement is based on the value commitments specified by the leadership of the institution. To be meaningful, the setting of aims, purposes, or goals cannot

rest on abstract statements but must indicate the structure, design, and activities which are characteristic of a particular institution. In other words, goal-setting tells us what we must "do" in order to become what we want to "be."[1]

Many researchers interested in higher education, and especially the study of colleges and universities as complex organizations, point out the difficulty of clearly defining meaningful goals for this type of organization. A major reason underlying this problem for colleges and universities is the less tangible nature of the products and the multiple forms that their products may take. Most other organizations--business, industry, government--can point to a tangible product as its output and employ market reactions to evaluate the product. Thompson and McEwen aptly summarize these issues when they say:

> The university perhaps has even greater difficulties in evaluating its environmental situation through response to its output. Its range of 'products' is enormous, extending from astronomers to zoologists. The test of a competent specialist is not always standardized and may be changing, and the university's success in turning out 'educated' people is judged by many and often conflicting standards. The university's product is in process for four or more years and when it is placed on the 'market' it can be only imperfectly judged.[17]

This observation has almost equal force when one is considering other types of educational institutions as well, e.g., state colleges and junior colleges.

The assessment of other types of goals for colleges and universities must also be considered beyond the question of educational effectiveness. Other general institutional goals include public service and research. Evaluation of research contributions made by faculty is generally somewhat easier than the assessment of accomplishments as regards the public service function of institutions.

Not only do most colleges and universities have difficulty assessing the quality of the student product, but they also stumble when it comes to systematically assessing change in environmental conditions that might well have fundamental implications for institutional mission and role. Thompson and McEwen, as well as Selznick and others, remind us that goal-setting for all types of organizations must be a continuous and adaptive process where the mix of priorities may undergo major modifications due to generic changes in the environment.

One of the key functions, then, of institutional leadership is to define the basic value commitments of their organization. In contrast to other organizational settings, where leadership is commonly associated with top-level administrators, a broader view is necessary in higher education. It seems more appropriate to view institutional leadership within colleges and universities as shared by faculty, students, administrators, and trustees. John Corson expresses this point of view when he states:

> The process of deciding is distinctive in the college or university in the degree to which final responsibility for making decisions is diffused....It follows, hence, that the government of a college or university poses distinctive problems in finding ways of enlisting and integrating the energies, initiative, and zeal of the relatively larger number among whom responsibility for decision making is shared.[18]

Similarly, Burton Clark says that authority in colleges and universities "is not as closely knit, nor as hierarchical, as in most other settings."[19] Abbott states that administration is to be defined "...not as people but as the processe by which and through which objectives are defined, resources are developed and organized in pursuit of these objectives, evaluation of results is accomplished, plans are made and remade. On this definition, obviously, 'administrators' have

no monopoly on 'administration'; the faculty has a vast stake and role in it."[20]

These minimal premises about institutional leadership suggest certain of the important issues and questions that must be considered in an examination of shifting centers of power within the superstructure of higher education. In the investigation of potential and real assaults on institutional leadership and authority by national and statewide forces more obviously "external" to the campus and the new claims to authority by students and faculty within institutions, we might seek answers to such questions as:

> What essential features of institutional purpose and direction are affected by important changes in the distribution of authority and influence "outside" and "inside" various types of colleges and universities?
>
> Are there important differences in the way in which these changes affect universities, state colleges, or junior colleges?
>
> What affect have external forces had on the internal distribution of authority and role in governance of administrators, faculty, and students?
>
> Due to the increasing complexity of the decision-making process in higher education, is it necessary to conceive of authority and decision-making according to some other model than presently exists in most institutions?
>
> What alternative models of participation are possible to accommodate the several principles of decision-making--authority, expertise, vested interests--in a manner that satisfies "outside" commitments of institutions but also preserves their distinctive identity?

Although it is not possible to explore each of these questions fully in the sections to follow, they serve to identify certain issues uppermost in the minds of many researchers who are attempting to obtain a better understanding of these problems and many administrators who are faced daily with the practical issues of directing their institutions.

Changing Centers of Power

The National Scene

Earlier several of the major forces and trends in higher education were reviewed. The scope, variety, origin, and magnitude of these several forces has resulted in fundamental change for most colleges and universities--the breakdown of traditional boundaries between the campus and the community, the state, the nation, and international affairs. Today, colleges and universities are being pulled into society and its problems to an extent unprecedented at any time in the history of American higher education. This master trend forces educational institutions to re-examine and re-evaluate their basic function in society.

Since it is impossible to discuss each of the forces and trends mentioned above, I shall focus the remaining discussion in this section on basic changes, trends, and shifts of power in the more or less formal hierarchy of higher education. Thus, we shall examine significant developments at the national and state levels, and attempt to assess what these changes and trends imply, first for the authority structure of higher education, and second, for leadership at the local institutional level.

To begin with, we shall discuss the developing fiscal crisis in higher education. State treasuries are reaching the point where available income sources will be insufficient to match all state expenditures. The simple conclusion reached by many is that the federal government must play an increasingly important role in the future financing of higher education. Last year, for example, the total capital and recurrent expenditure by all higher education institutions in the United States was $16.8 billion, and the federal government provided 23 percent of this sum, including research support and loans.

Anticipated costs for higher education by 1975 as projected by USOE are around $24 billion; other persons offer an even higher figure, possibly $40 billion. Alan Pifer suggests that if the Viet Nam War ends by 1970, the level of federal support might climb to as much as 50 percent of the total costs for higher education. Further, it is anticipated that the type of federal support will likely be increasingly of the general, non-categorical type. This would be in addition to the existing forms of categorical support for construction, student aid, research, and the like. Whereas income from state and local governments covers about 26 percent of the total costs of higher education, this figure will likely decline in the future as higher education costs continue to soar.[21]

Such developments raise a whole host of important questions and issues; the most fundamental issue concerns likely changes in the authority structure of higher education and its impact on institutional autonomy. Is it possible for colleges and universities to receive greater federal support without also being subject to greater surveillance and control in the use of these monies? I think not. But the critical issue is not really how much control as it is what kinds of control and how the controls will be exercized. Furthermore, how will the system of control be devised? Who will participate in the formulation of these policies? How will participation be worked out? And finally, what allowances will be made to adapt the system of controls as new conditions and circumstances arise?

The critical point here is that prior federal appropriations and the anticipated expansion of these monies for higher education is not the end-product or outcome of any rational, systematic long-range national plan for high education. Therefore, the bases for legitimacy about federal support of higher education and the systems of control used to administer the monies appropriated

to states and individual institutions can be viewed as little more than expedient solutions to pending crises. Furthermore, the extent to which the professional competence of educators has been used to assess alternative forms of support and policies for administrative control in the use of these monies is ambiguous. What this implies is the precarious nature of the federal support programs for higher education. More important it means that educators could take a posture of leadership in seeing to it that: first, a national plan for higher education is formulated; second, the opportunity for a variety of forms of participation by educators in developing such a plan is provided; third, an important degree of openness is allowed in the authority structure so that institutions are not overly and unnecessarily burdened by the constraints of rules and procedures; and fourth, an opportunity exists to bring about significant changes in policies and procedures as warranted by new experiences and changed conditions. Recent conversations with persons closely associated with the Washington scene indicate that certain individuals in USOE are now beginning to think about how, to what extent, and in what form USOE might stimulate, expedite, and support the development of a national plan for higher education. It would seem to me that important issues and decisions will be at stake in the architecture of a national plan and that a wide variety of educators must exert leadership in this important task

Some of the policies that might constitute part of a national plan were suggested in a recent article.

> One policy would be to establish a minimum standard of free education through the fourteenth grade, that is, through the lower division, or junior college, for all young men and women who successfully complete the earlier grades....A second policy would be the equalization of opportunity for access to higher education beyond the junior college stage, including upper division work and graduate academic and professional training, for any qualified--and I must emphasize the word qualified--American citizen no matter what his age, sex, family or

> economic circumstances or place of residence....A third policy has to do with the amount of high-level graduate and professional training and advanced research capacity available to the nation. It envisages the creation of a list of designated 'national universities' which would receive preferential treatment in the support of their research laboratories and other facilities for advanced study and research....A fourth policy has to do with the role of higher education in helping to solve the complex problems of our great urban areas....A fifth policy is concerned with the nation's international responsibilities....A final group of policies relates to improving the academic quality of our colleges and universities, in every field, but especially in key subjects such as mathematics, the sciences and English language.[22]

It would seem to me that important issues such as those raised above, as well as many others, require wide-spread discussion and debate among educators especially but also among business and industrial leaders, and state and national officials. The posture that educational leaders take on the many critical issues in higher education and the style in which this leadership is exercised should have a fundamental impact on the character of national planning for higher education. For example, the proposal for free education through the fourteenth grade suggests that funding sources for junior colleges may increasingly be either federal and state rather than local and regional. As this happen the legal control of junior colleges will necessarily move to the state level with the likely result that junior colleges will not be as responsive to local community educational needs. Furthermore, the greater centralization of authorit at the state level means that flexibility needed at the campus level to adapt and to innovate in response to new developments and demands associated with technological and social change may be seriously jeopardized.

Another way in which the role of the federal government encroaches upon the authority of professionals is dramatically illustrated by the recent bill introduced by Representative Louis C. Wyman (Republican, New Hampshire). He

introduced amendments to the Science Foundation's money bill for fiscal 1969. The Wyman amendments in essence would deny loans, grants, and other educational aid to students who participate in campus riots, sit-ins, seizures, and other disruptions. In fact, it would prohibit federal funds to be paid to students or teachers who "at any time after the effective date of this act, wilfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of the university or college."

A national posture such as is illustrated by the Wyman amendments signifies a loss of confidence by many in the capacity for higher education to manage law and order in a manner acceptable to public scrutiny and judgment. More will be said on this point in the next section where we examine some recent shifts in mood by state legislators about state education. I would submit only the observation that such expedient actions by federal authorities represent an assault on local campus autonomy. The impending enlargement of the federal interest in higher education financing will result in further challenges to campus authority. These and other forces impinging on the earlier tranquility of college campuses leads one to the position that campus authority once viewed as a given must not be considered problematic.

The State Scene

First of all, let us consider certain new attitudes and concerns expressed by legislators regarding higher education. Once again, my interest is to emphasize those things which may have important implications at the local campus level Although one can separate for analytical purposes several issues and concerns expressed by legislators in the four states we are studying, the empirical interrelatedness of these topics necessitates their being handled in a more integrated fashion. Essentially, the issues boil down to money, student/faculty

conduct, returns on investments, and the role of the legislature in planning, budgeting, and general control over higher education. The views of one California legislator captures one cut of the overall problem faced by many legislators when he says:

> I wonder if the different segments of higher education would want the legislature to get more involved in their problems. I doubt it. Right now I'm working on a letter regarding academic freedom and autonomy. What I'm trying to point out is that the legislature is having an increasingly difficult time defending higher education to the general public and our various constituencies. What I try to do is suggest that behavior can be classified in at least two categories--legitimate and illegitimate. When students or faculty are wilfully abusing existing rules or ways of behaving, I think they're engaging in illegitimate behavior. I'm only trying to suggest that I would like people in higher education to help me understand how to explain or better defend some of the recent student unrest, 'The Beard', and similar behavior to the public. If educators don't draw some line on what they think is defensible student and faculty behavior, and just let anything go, then you can be well assured that their autonomy will be in jeopardy... the legislature will simply have to move in to control the situation.

This view, or something like it, was voiced by several of the key legislators we interviewed in California and reflects both a sincere interest (by some legislators, at least) with trying to understand what is happening on college campuses and a warning to the effect that controls may be imposed from outside the campus if internal control mechanisms or procedures cannot be shown to work reasonably well on our campuses. This, to say the least, is a major challenge to administrators, faculty, and students alike. To have rules, but yet be actively engaged in examining and adapting them to new circumstances poses a fundamental problem. Unfortunately, however, it would appear that many campuses are not even willing to entertain the possibility that existing rules and procedures need modification; but instead administrators arbitrarily impose what are viewed by many as archaic and stilted views as to what constitute

acceptable student conduct. To repeat...what was once given may now be problematic. Authority, and the principles on which authority is based, likely needs serious re-examination and re-evaluation. One could only hope that the necessary processes to get about the business of studying campus authority will be more widely initiated on college and university campuses, and that legislators will have the patience not to impose an expedient, seemingly simple solution of a complex problem. The expedient approach is illustrated by the following statement by another legislator:

> I think the junior colleges are doing a fine job. They've got good administration. But the administration at the state colleges and university stinks! Student behavior and faculty behavior is terrible! I know it only involves a few hundred students...but kick them out! I still think that no matter what the 'inmates' think, the university and state colleges belong to the state and we (the people, the legislators) should run them. The junior colleges certainly aren't teaching morally destructive stuff like I hear about and see at the university and state colleges.

One might posit that similar protest movements will penetrate the junior colleges shortly. The influx of students from a wider range of racial, cultural and social backgrounds suggests this possibility.

Another emphasis which comes through quite clearly in our discussions with legislators is their growing concern about financing higher education. Some of the flavor of this concern can be gleaned from a Florida legislator when he says:

> If we are going to save money we must control money, and in order to control money we shall have to plan. Program budgeting is the key and this new approach is receiving a big push within our state government. Soon, we hope, all our universities will prepare their budgets according to this model.

An Illinois legislator expressed his views somewhat more bluntly when he said:

> Education has long been a 'sacred cow' and now some tough decisions must be made regarding its future course and level of support. These decisions can no longer be avoided. Some kind of performance budgeting will be developed.

Although legislators see program budgeting essentially as a control device, educators take a somewhat different view.

The reaction to program budgeting by educators in all four states is mixed. On the one hand, some educators feel that this new approach results in the centralization of power and authority within state offices due to the availability of more information about colleges and universities. On the other hand, some educators think that more flexibility is given to the local campus since state-level review and appropriation of funds is expressed in more comprehensive categories. Each of these positions has some validity. But in addition we must bear in mind that the formal systems of budgeting or planning may be affected by the flow of informal processes, avenues of influence, and the more subtle impact of individuals and personalities. Thus, program,incremental or functional budgeting systems, in concept, are quite different. Nevertheless, their operation in a particular context may reflect or mask conceptual differences when individuals and groups of individuals of one bent or another administer such systems. Charles Hitch seems to take this position. He suggests that programming and systems analysis "make <u>possible</u> a higher degree of centralization of decision-making, but are consistent with any degree appropriate to the circumstances." He continues, then, by indicating that the style of management employed by key administrators makes a substantial effect on the centralization or decentralization of decision-making.[23]

A related issue is that of cost/benefit analysis. The function of program budgeting is to link substantive planning to fiscal planning, and long-range planning with annual or biennial budgets. Not one of the states in our study has yet engineered and implemented these important linkages. Nevertheless, once programs are defined and budgets are developed to support these programs, then it is not long until the question of evaluation of achievements arises. In contemporary jargon, the frequently used term is "cost/benefit analysis." This may include costing out present operations or programs, and then projecting future alternative programs with price tags attached. Thus, the "decision-makers" can select among alternatives the one or more choices desired. One of the biggest issues is the criterion problem. Thus far, one of the best treatments of this problem appears in a study by the Sub-Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, U. S. Senate. In their "Illustrative List of Criteria for the Evaluation of Proposed Programs," the topic "Intellectual Development" is listed and its objective stated. The evaluation criteria include:

1. Annual number and percent of persons satisfactorily completing various numbers of years of schooling.

2. Annual number and percent of dropouts at various educational levels.

3. Annual number and percent of each age group enrolled in educational institutions.

4. 'Intellectual development attainment' measures, such as performance on various standardized achievement tests at different ages and educational levels. Major educational levels, for example, reading skills, reasoning skills, and general knowledge might be measured.

5. Performance on the achievement tests indicated in criterion 4 as related to intelligence tests (to indicate attainment relative to capacity).

6. Annual number and percent of students continuing their education at post-high school educational institutions.

7. Participation in selected cultural and civic activities (and perhaps the number of persons who read newspapers, or at least certain parts of them).[24]

These criteria quite clearly emphasize the quantitative approach to evaluation. Educators need to be careful that the consequences of meeting this type of standard may mean the loss of qualitative considerations in the assessment of educational effectiveness. And many times, educators take the position that the less tangible but highly significant changes which occur in student development are much more important as regards the impact of education than the more easily cited measures of quantitative change.

The states of California and New York are more advanced in their development and application of program budgeting and cost/benefit analysis than Illinois or Florida. But the concern of legislators with the economic benefits from investments in higher education exists in all four states. Pertinent to these legislative concerns are two topics--the cost of higher education, the benefits of higher education--presently being examined by the Joint Legislative Committee for Higher Education in California.[25] And further, Assemblyman Leroy Greene authored a bill to establish a statewide testing program in lower education. This may be indicative of what will happen in California higher education.

Unfortunately, educators generally have not paid too much attention to the increasingly important question of "educational effectiveness."[26] An often stated remark made to us during our research was, "Effectiveness is an important question, I guess, but it's so difficult to measure." One could stand back from this situation as a researcher and simply conclude, "Legislators and congressmen may want evidence, but educators are not going to provide it, and that's that!" On the other hand, one might suggest that it would be wiser for educators, whether in junior colleges, state colleges, or universities, to exert leadership by mounting a major effort to identify the variety of dimensions and

methodologies which might be used to assess the educational effectiveness of our colleges and universities. As one California senator expressed it:

> The thing I'm most interested in is the function of the university, state colleges, and junior colleges. We need to make them more efficient and improve their quality. I'm worried about what students are getting out of their 'education' and I'm concerned about what the state is getting out of their investment in higher education.

In the main, junior colleges have been sold to legislators on the basis of economical commuter institutions. However, it is becoming apparent that the costs involved in providing this type of education may be much higher. There are many other dimensions to the contemporary legislative/higher education relationships as related to the present topic, e.g., the role of the legislature in higher education planning and the build-up of committee staffs with technical experts in education.

Another important issue at the state level concerns the expansion of powers of many statewide planning and coordinating boards for higher education and the creation of new segment boards. In the state of New York, for example, the Board of Regents has since its inception the responsibility to function as the overall coordinating mechanism for lower and higher education, both public and private. In 1960, an important bill was passed by the legislature giving the Regents responsibility for developing a statewide plan for higher education. This is an exceedingly difficult assignment given not only the variety of institutions but the important historical dominance of higher education in this state by private institutions, the burgeoning developments of State University of New York, and the traditional leadership role played by City University of New York in providing for the educational needs of such a vast metropolitan complex as New York City. Very recently the Board of Regents, recognizing the necessity

that higher education planning on a statewide basis must be given even greater recognition and attention, sought and received advice from a prominent educational consulting firm. The advice they received was to elevate the planning function to a new office reporting directly to the Commissioner of Education. This office would be staffed and financed so that the Regents could exercise a more direct and effective role in the leadership for statewide planning. Since earlier planning in this system was accomplished primarily at the segment level (i.e., SUNY, CUNY), one key issue is the amount of latitude that will be given to the segments for their own planning. That is, will the Regents undertake to provide detailed planning for SUNY, CUNY, and the private colleges and universities, or will the Regents focus their planning on more broadly conceived issues and questions? This kind of problem--one which again raises questions about the distribution of authority--pervades all state-segment boards and segment board-institution relationships. In order to iron out certain of these problems, a series of meetings is occurring between SUNY and representatives of the State Department of Education where single questions--such as the degree of detail in long-range plans--are discussed and debated toward the end of achieving written agreements.

Similar illustrations of expanding powers for statewide boards is seen in recent changes for the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The General Assembly in 1965 gave the Board responsibility for the provisions of the Public Junior College Act and added the additional functions of approving institutional facilities and establishing minimum admission standards for state-supported institutions. Earlier, in 1964, Governor Kerner designated the Board as the state commission to administer the Federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In addition to the modification of existing boards, new boards are being created. The new Board of Governors for the California

junior colleges is one of the most recent examples of this type of development.

One of the most pressing problems as state and segment boards are created and their powers are expanded is the type of leadership role such boards will assume and how effective their work will be toward improving the overall quality of higher education. In a recent paper, Lyman Glenny discusses the growing political leadership role of coordinating boards. He observes that the trend is for coordinating boards to be composed either of a majority or a totality of citizen members who do not directly administer or govern any public institution. The appointment of more lay members to boards, according to Glenny, adds considerably to the political strength of the board.[27] However, we might add that this may also mean that important values and expertise represented by institutional members may be lost or sacrificed in the exchange of influence between the governor's office and the board. When professional expertise is diminished or minimized with the appointment of all lay boards, then a greater responsibility arises among the board's professional staff to provide the required expertise. Opinions voiced both in New York and California by administrators and faculty in many instances severely criticized the quality of staff reports. An important dimension of the board/institution relationship is the clash on the one hand between the legal authority vested in the board and the professional expertise at the institutional level. As mentioned above, New York is trying to solve this problem by rearranging their statewide organizational structure for planning in higher education. California's approach to this problem is difficult to identify since several key developments are underway: the appointment of a new director for the Coordinating Council, the planning activities of the Joint Legislative Committee, and new appointments to each of the major boards in higher education. Furthermore, one of the most

important recent developments-the creation of a state board for the junior colleges--changes the game of coordination in California in significant ways which will undoubtedly create some new conflicts--such as the relationship between state and local boards--while resolving certain long-standing problems for junior colleges in California. One legislator expressed his views on the new boards as follows:

> I'd say that there hasn't been any extensive planning in the junior colleges due to the lack of a state board and the lack of time devoted to junior colleges by the State Department of Education. Even the Master Plan didn't provide a springboard for planning in the junior colleges. I hope that the new junior college board will do more planning. This board will have some difficult problems to deal with. For instance, a single vocational/technical boards is required to coordinate the allocation of federal funds for the junior colleges and for the high schools. This board straddles the junior college board and the State Department of Education.

An issue forcing the necessity for planning is the commitment to universal higher education and the possibility that education through the junior college level will become mandatory. For example, one legislator sees this fundamental development in the following way:

> I see a trend that will put almost all our students into junior colleges for their first two years in college. Then, those wanting a bachelor's degree will go on to the state colleges. And finally, those seeking graduate work will go to the university. I just think the shear cost of higher education will force us into this type of specialization.

Related to the more abstract goals of universal higher education is the question of the future role and mission of junior colleges. Several legislators in California expressed concern over this issue though in a relatively narrow manner. Illustrative of this view are the comments by one legislator:

> I think our junior colleges are becoming or have become too 'blue-blooded'. There is a difference between vocational/ technical education and transfer programs but insufficient attention is given to find out what the nature of this difference is and how we can get the most of each type of program. I think the junior colleges spend too much time trying to pump kids into higher education that is, transfer to state colleges or the university, and not enough time building up the quality of their vocational/technical programs and encouraging certain students to enter these programs.

The broader problem alluded to by this statement is the necessity for junior colleges to examine their particular contributions to the future as well as the contemporary technological needs of an automated society.

Two recent statements summarize many of the key questions, issues, and problems about state boards for junior colleges. James L. Wattenbarger discussed several areas of responsibility and attempts a delineation when he suggests that state boards assume responsibility for such important matters as: over-all state planning (collection and release of statistical information, adequate planning for new institutions, scope of responsibilities each institution will assume, establishing mechanisms for effective relationships between the board and local campuses, i.e., councils for presidents, academic vice presidents, deans of students); developing only those policy statements applicable to <u>all</u> institutions; establishing and enforcing minimum qualifications for faculty members, final approval of the employment or dismissal of the chief local administrator; creating equitable guidelines for initiating, continuing, and expanding programs as well as maintaining and improving their quality; and lastly, relating the total junior college enterprise to other agencies. An important concluding observation by Wattenbarger is:

> The modification of the exclusively local orientation of community junior colleges requires that each institution give up some of its own decision-making responsibilities to the state coordinating agency. As difficult as this may seem, it is essential to state coordination which is without question the major trend in current developments of community junior colleges.[28]

This paper is of special interest here both as regards what it says as well as what it leaves unsaid. It is an attempt to deal squarely with many important aspects of the distribution of authority issue. This we know will be a constant problem requiring careful observation, deliberation, and adaptation. One might ask how much agreement exists among the constituent parties involved in coordination about the distribution of particular dimensions of authority. Our own research suggests that agreement among state coordinators, campus administrators, and faculty is not very high as to who should have initiating, reviewing, recommending, or final authority across a rather wide range of topics--determination of institutional mission and role, program development, personnel policies, fiscal management, and the like.

Leland Medsker and George Clark's study of governance of junior colleges shows considerable variation among administrators or among faculty about the powers that should be vested in a state level agency. In regard to the views of junior college staff, the authors state:

> While there was a general agreement by a majority that services should be provided from the state, only four of 11 powers suggested were regarded as desirably located at the state level.[29]

The four powers included: "Effecting liaison between junior colleges and other segments of education; determining minimum qualifications for faculty and administrators; setting standards for graduation; and, serving as an official

spokesman for junior colleges as a whole."[30] On the other hand, those powers which the staff apparently think should be retained at the campus level include: "Approving textbooks and teaching materials; approving appointments of chief administrators in local colleges; approving courses of study in local colleges; approving curricula in local colleges; and, approving the academic calendar".[31] Again, without going into the details, important areas of overlap and disagreement were observed among the responses of chief administrators included in the Medsker/Clark study. These observations point out that the distribution of authority is in transition. Preliminary evidence indicates that this transition will be resolved in the direction of increased centralization.

Implications for Institutional Leadership and Strategies for Change

An attempt has been made to review several important forces impinging on colleges and universities in general and junior colleges in particular. The whole authority structure of higher education is presently undergoing major strains as a result of these varied and complex forces. Let us now turn to a discussion of the implications of these forces for institutional leadership and strategies for change.

Pervasive Uncertainty

A common element that permeates contemporary organizations of higher education is uncertainty. Colleges and universities are being pressed more than ever before into statewide and federal dependencies and interrelationships. These new organizational arrangements introduce new expectations and commitments to which educational institutions must respond. Additionally, the internal

affairs of these institutions are being turned upside-down by the infusion of broader societal issues and the demands placed upon higher education in general to be more in tune with society and more sensitive to the needs of students as individuals. Lord Franks, speaking at U.C. President Charles Hitch's inauguration, aptly describes the contemporary mood of uncertainty when he says:

> I end on a personal note. When I look at society today...I see growing uncertainty; an uncertainty which seems almost to grow in proportion to the extension of the means at our disposal. It is a long time since Aristotle asked himself a question and gave his views on the good life, about how an individual and his society should conduct themselves to achieve lasting satisfaction. His views today sound strangely in our ears. Few of us think that the ultimate satisfactions of life are to be attained in metaphysical speculation. But his question remains a good one. It is because we cannot answer it that we live in the shadow of uncertainty.

Recent developments in organizational theory indicate a growing concern about the concept of uncertainty--its manifestations, range of areas affected, and the long-term significance stemming from alternative ways of managing uncertainty. James D. Thompson in Organizations in Action argues that a useful strategy in the study of organizations is to treat them not as determinate or "closed-systems", but as "open-systems". This approach takes cognizance of the interplay between organizations and the forces impinging on them from the external environment. When you view organizations as "open-systems", uncertainty becomes the basic problem for complex organizations. Coping with such uncertainty is the essence of the administrative process. Paradoxically, it is the task of administration to reduce uncertainty while at the same time seeking to maintain organizational flexibility to meet new and changing circumstances.[32]

Similarly, the French Sociologist, Michel Crozier, views uncertainty and its relationship to power as a fundamental problem in the study of organizations

when he states:

> ...new power relationships develop around the loopholes in the regulatory system. Groups fight for control of the ultimate strategic sources of uncertainties, and their fates in the group struggle depend on their ability to control these. New power relationships will have, as a consequence, new kinds of dependencies and frustrations, which will exert pressure for more centralization and reinforce the demand aspect of the subordinate-superior relationship, creating a sort of vicious circle that, at least at this level, it will be impossible to evade.[33]

Both Thompson and Crozier are analyzing complex organizations, but our focus is on networks of complex organizations where uncertainties are even more pervasive. When attempts are made to reduce uncertainty within the network, a strong tendency exists toward greater centralization. However, the judicious development and application of rules and procedures may reduce uncertainty where necessary without resulting in unnecessary centralization.

In the next two sections, these general comments are developed further by: first, discussing several implications or consequences of uncertainty for institutional leadership; and second, outlining alternative strategies that might be used to cope with these uncertainties.

Implications for Institutional Leadership

One important effect of the new and expanding forces impinging on colleges and universities is that administrators are being forced to become more sensitive to the network of formal and informal organizations. Administrators are concentrating more of their energies on "foreign affairs" and thus assuming greater responsibility for sensing and evaluating the significance of external developments. Further, participation in policy formulation in the superstructure of higher education becomes an issue of considerable magnitude since such decisions

often have direct and fundamental consequences for the daily operation, yearly expansion, and long-term development of institutions. Thus, institutional administrators want a more significant voice in many extra-institutional issues.

Although attention to external affairs by administrators is important to their campus, new problems emerge as the administrative corps is faced with an increasingly wide range of responsibilities. The absolute number of administrators is growing in all educational institutions. However, this increase is not proportionate to the new demands being placed on administrators. Thus, many presidents, vice presidents, and deans find themselves in a difficult and perplexing situation. Not only must they cope with the traditional requirements of office at their institution, but they are drawn more frequently into state and national activities.

There are various approaches to the situation. Some administrators may try to resolve this dilemma by ignoring outside demands, although this seems to be an increasingly difficult line to follow. Others will choose to become fully involved in external affairs and issues. However, mounting tensions within colleges and universities would nullify this alternative unless special provisions (e.g., delegate more responsibility to divisional directors, department chairmen, and faculty bodies) are made to manage internal problems. Thus, a combination of strategies which alters the traditional division of labor between students, faculty, administrators, and trustees may be necessary. More attention should be given to expertise or competence as regards particular problems rather than assigning responsibilities on the basis of organizational positions. This arrangement would be more open, fluid, and adaptable to particular problems as they arise.

A second important effect resulting from greater external pressures on institution is that all colleges and universities will pay more attention to clearly defining and implementing a particular mission and role. State and national decision-makers are beginning to require clearer justifications for budgetary appropriations. Further, legislators and congressmen are demanding evidence about the economic returns for investments in higher education. Vested interests, special appeals, and political power will never be eliminated from these important decisions. But the utility of applying approaches which take a longer and more comprehensive perspective are gaining in force.

Beyond the above external considerations, new problems are developing in the internal administration of institutions. Students are increasingly dissatisfied with the stagnation that grips most educational institutions and the marginal role of students in setting educational policy. Faculty in growing numbers are also manifesting their dissatisfaction with the malaise of educational institutions. The rapid rise of unions reflects part of this concern. Such student and faculty discomfort is further accentuated by the rapid rate of technological and social change. These considerations imply continuing crises for college and university campuses. A more active role by all institutional groups could offset the negative consequences of these crises.

The above leads to a third implication resulting from expanding pressures on higher education--that the protection of institutional integrity and character depends on careful defense of institutional mission and role. The development of consensus and commitment among institutional members regarding institutional goals is an important part of this defense. Selznick argues that "...under conditions of political combat, those who have no firm values of their own becomes the instruments of the values of others."[34] Similarly, he states that

organizations face the fundamental problem of self-maintenance, and clearly articulated values and purposes are central to the preservation of organizational existence.[35] But in addition to firm values, institutional leaders need the power and the will to implement these values. A lack of power is evident in budget committee hearings, for instance, when educators are not able to present justification for a particular campus size, average class size, faculty/student ratio, or special instructional technique. "Hard" data to support their arguments are non-existent. As mentioned earlier, the values presently espoused by many state and national officials are oriented primarily to issues of economy, efficiency, and accountability. Growing signs of centralization of decision-making outside the local campus also indicate that issues of educational policy will be constantly evaded unless institutions actively and forthrightly tackle these critical questions and issues. The pressures for standardization and regularization outside institutions are strong and becoming even stronger. Thus, firm value commitments which can be supported by research data are needed to defend institutional mission and role. Currently, the fragmentation within institutions vitiates the protection of institutional integrity.

The rate of technological, social, and political change indicates a fourth way in which uncertainty impinges upon institutional leadership. This calls for a greater recognition of the need for all institutions to establish <u>mechanisms for deliberate and continuous change</u>. Not only is it important that institutional mission and role be more clearly specified, but it is also mandatory that institutions possess the capacity to modify and adapt institutional purposes and processes to new circumstances and new commitments. So far, change in higher education is predominately the result of crisis. Furthermore, change is more likely to be adaptive (i.e., reactive and passive) rather than innovative

(i.e., active and anticipatory). Recent events at Columbia, as well as outbreaks at other American colleges and universities, demonstrate the lack of consensus about institutional purposes, and the frailty of present-day leadership to cope with these tensions and conflicts. Institutional vulnerability is at a maximum when mission and role is vague, and when systematic processes for adaptation and change are weak or non-existent.

This leads to a final point as regards uncertainties about the current patterns of institutional leadership. In the theoretical section, a model is presented which stresses that the fundamental task of leadership is the definition of value commitments for organizations. Furthermore, the concept of leadership is broadened in comparison to more traditional views by suggesting that each constitutent party--students, faculty, administrators, trustees--share responsibility for governance. Each party possesses a particular competence and perspective, and thus each can contribute to the resolution of many of the problems which educational institutions face.

It is worth noting that this model of leadership is in contrast to the position espoused by Clark Kerr. In Kerr's view, as developed in his book The Uses of the University, the administrator functions more in the capacity of a "mediator-initiator" than as a charismatic, legal-rational, or traditional leader.[36] The task of the administrator is to promote peace and progress within modern, pluralistic institutions. The administrator provides the opportunities appropriate for the full airing and discussion of views and desires of constituent groups. Under this concept, the administrator is less likely to direct, attempt to influence, or actually decide what course of action shall be taken to resolve a problem. Instead, the "opportunity to persuade" is the dominant mode of leadership.

In contrast to the view presented earlier, this conceptualization places leadership primarily in the office of the administrator and deemphasizes the importance of building and maintaining institutional character and integrity. A major defect in this pluralistic conception of leadership is that values or goals are purposely left vague and ill-defined. Thus, the bases for authority and the procedures used to define authority structures remain nebulous and subject to the interaction of vested interest groups. Recent authority confrontations now rampant on many campuses are one manifestation of the defects that the pluralistic leadership model has created. Students and faculty seek to substitute new principles upon which to base authority. They desire a fuller share in the process by which basic institutional commitments are made.

If these observations have merit, what this suggests is that authority might be viewed as a process of negotiation based on firm value commitments; an open-system of authority that is more responsive to pressures for change originating both inside and outside campuses. We tried earlier to suggest certain characteristics of this new model, e.g., administration is a process; many different persons may participate in decision-making on the basis of their special competencies and technical knowledge, rules and procedures established at one point do not become inflexible or unresponsive as new problems and circumstances arise. But in addition, another point needs mentioning. Whereas Selznick supports the view that top administrators assume primary responsibility for setting institutional mission and role, and Kerr would argue for a less directive and more mediative role for administrators, our view holds that administrators function very importantly as leaders in the sense of guiding persons and processes to those critical issues and problems which affect the basic character of the institution. We are suggesting, then, a type of leadership more

concerned with setting the limits of permissivity than determining the specifics for institutional development and change.

Given these implications for institutional leadership, we move now to a more systematic discussion of various approaches which can help resolve these growing areas of uncertainty.

Strategies for Coping With Uncertainty

Each of the strategies discussed below rests on somewhat different principles of leadership and methodologies for change. We first examine a strategy that might be labeled as ad hoc study groups. The following types of reports are illustrative of this strategy: Education at Berkeley ("The Muscatine Report"), Report of the Committee on Academic Innovation and Development (U.C. Los Angeles), and The Culture of the University - Governance and Education (U.C. Berkeley).[37] These approaches to change may create sporadic interest but in general have not as yet generated fundamental change as regards curriculum, instructional methods, or the overall aims and purposes of education. Almost to the case, each effort has floundered due to a lack of long-term support by students, faculty, administrators, or the ponderous weight of established procedures and norms. Only about 20 percent of the recommendations in the "Muscatine Report" have been implemented; one of the more interesting proposals being the Board of Educational Development. The "Tussman Program" has achieved some remarkable success. Recent reports, however, suggest that monetary and other problems are threatening its long-term survival. Although these attempts to raise substantive questions and issues about the educational and general environmental conditions of campus life are usually the result of crises or spontaneous pressures for change, they do represent a vital and necessary

expression of conern that must be fostered and supported. However, once the crisis which motivated these reports subsides, the interest in altering the fundamental conditions which gave rise to the crisis diminishes. The road to inertia is paved with good reports.

Another approach is suggested in Warren Bennis' recent book, Changing Organizations. A scheme is outlined which relies heavily upon the use of extra-organizational specialists to study and effect change. Generally, the Bennis approach also focuses on the more formal, rational strategy for organizational change. The process of planned change involves a change-agent, who is brought in to help a client-system, which is the target for change. The change-agent, working in collaboration with the client-system, attempts to use valid knowledge to the client's situation and problems. These four elements taken in combination constitute what Bennis labels as planned change.

This approach to planning is not unknown to higher education. The state of Florida has relied heavily on this approach in their long-range planning for higher education. This is particularly the case as regards the development of new universities. On the basis of our research data, we observed that certain major proposals were unusually long in their implementation while others "never saw the light of day." Furthermore, a continuous process of planning was not implemented and many persons with whom we talked admitted that an over-reliance on outside consultants has significantly deterred the development of leadership in educational planning within the state. In a personal conversation with A. J. Brumbaugh just after our visit to Florida, he had these important comments about the use of outside consultants in educational planning:

> In general, a state or institution engaged in long-range planning should capitalize on all the resources that are available. Thus, one should attempt to identify people within institutions who possess special skills and knowledge and bring them into the planning process. People from outside the state should also be used, but it is important

> to distinguish two general types of consultants: the generalist and the specialist. Generalists can assist but not assume major responsibility in setting state or institutional priorities. This task is really the fundamental responsibility of the key policy-makers in the state or in the institution. On the other hand, specialists can be extremely useful once general directions and basic commitments have been made. They can provide the technical know-how that's not easy to come by if one has not faced these problems himself.

We come, then, to a third alternative. This strategy for building institutional integrity and institutionalizing processes for change results from our own research on long-range planning in higher education. It also represents the style of institutional leadership which we see as most appropriate to the new stance of negotiated authority discussed earlier.

In our view a central aspect of leadership is exercized through long-range planning. Planning should focus on those critical issues that establish institutional character and integrity. An overview of our findings at eighty-one institutions shows a marked contrast to this conception of long-range planning. First, planning at most institutions is: quantitative, periodic, piecemeal, institution-wide, deductive, routine, based on limited research, no priorities set and initiated by pressures external to the institutions. Second, faculty participation in institutional planning is generally light and accomplished primarily through existing committee structures, which usually separate the planning efforts of faculty from those of administrators. Third, administrative encouragement is most often cited as the reason for faculty involvement whereas reluctance to participate rests on such attitudes as: planning is an administrative task, the traditional discipline orientation decreases commitment to the institution, internal conflicts divert available time and energy, and faculty are impractical. And finally, these findings show that institutional planning is not addressing itself to the fundamental issues of educational policy and it

is not thought of as a legitimate part of the faculty role.

In an effort to overcome many of the shortcomings associated with current planning, we are developing a paradigm for institutional planning. A brief description of the dimensions of this paradigm is as follows:

1. Scope- Long-range planning includes the examination and determination of all the major policies about institutional functions and activities: the definition of mission and role, programs (research and public service) and curricula, methods and form of instruction; recruitment, selection, promotion, and general welfare of the faculty; admissions criteria, academic standards, and student affairs; finances and facilities.

2. Priority- The definition of mission and role so as to identify special competencies and inadequacies is the first and most basic task of institutional planning. This includes the specification of priorities among the multiple ends of educational institutions as well as the establishment of priorities with regard to the other dimensions listed above.

3. Continuity- Planning is a continuous process of adapting to changing conditions. The process itself and the resultant changes are more important than any single written plan.

4. Research- Planning is informed and highly dependent on research which takes as its foci the critical questions and key issues facing the institution.

5. Participants- Faculty, students, administrators, and trustees all share responsibility for institutional planning. Each group has unique perspectives, attitudes, and types of expertise.

6. Participation- Planning involves both the initiation of and reaction to ideas where the role of initiator or reactor is played by various groups at different times. An exchange and interaction of ideas, experiences, interests, and attitudes is necessary. Participation will likely be heightened when special incentives--released time and additional resources--are provided.

7. Structure- Planning requires a special structure since existing student, faculty, and administrative structures are geared primarily to routine, day-to-day issues and often focus on fairly limited parts of the total institu-

tion. To encourage open communication among all parties and promote an institutional perspective, some type of joint steering committee is necessary. This group would likely work in close cooperation with the existing committee structure.

8. Implementation- The planning process includes specification of a time table and the general strategy by which specific proposals will be put into action.[40]

Findings from our research show that at those institutions where planning most closely approximates this paradigm, there is less fragmentation among faculty, administrators, and students and more identification by all parties with the aims of the institution. Faculty do not see planning as an "exercise in futility" but instead they view their involvement as a constructive and meaningful way to probe substantive issues of educational policy. In general, institutions with these characteristics are more likely to be new and emerging, or undergoing a radical change in their mission and role, or undertaking a major facilities expansion, or they are institutions that are highly experimental and innovative in their approach to curriculum, organizational design, and methods of instruction. However, we have also found this type of planning in more traditional institutions.

In conclusion, several important forces that are contributing to major shifts in the distribution of power, authority, and influence in higher education have been identified. Taken together, these forces indicate that the traditional boundaries of colleges and universities, as well as the established division of labor among students, faculty, and administrators, are undergoing major changes. Uncertainty is pervasive and is the key organizational problem faced by colleges and universities.

A laissez-faire philosophy and methodology, typical of colleges and universities today, is not sufficient to meet the new demands for change.

Instead, the uncertainties which predominate must be met squarely by new strategies which draw upon the special competencies of all constituent groups. Already many faculty and students are questioning educational policy and procedures. Unfortunately, these efforts pass by the administrator because his attentions are directed to the quantitative, means-oriented issues forced on him by state and national agencies. What must be effected is a new and more conscious interest in the educational ends and means of higher education institutions so that their contribution to society is more evident and their ability to change is more prevalent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gardner, John W., "Universities as Designers of the Future," Educational Record (Fall, 1967), pp. 315-319.

2. Anderson and Bowman make some important distinctions regarding the democratization of educational opportunity which indicate that similar concepts such as universal higher education are not as clearly understood as one might assume. For example, do we mean by universal higher education: a) an equal amount of education for everyone, b) education sufficient to bring every student to a given standard, c) education sufficient to permit each person to achieve his potential, or d) continued opportunities for education so long as gains in learning per input of teaching match some agreed norm? For a fuller discussion of this, see C. Arnold Anderson and Mary Jean Bowman, "Theoretical Considerations in Educational Planning," Chapter One in Bereday, George Z.F. and Lauwerys, Joseph A. (Editors), The World Book of Education, 1967: Educational Planning, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1967).

3. Wattenbarger, James I., "The Development of Community Colleges: Trends, Issues, Problems," in Partnership for Progress, the report of a legislative work conference on Higher Education in the West, December 3-5, 1967, WICHE, Boulder, Colorado.

4. Wilson, Logan, "The Changing Power Structure of Higher Education," paper presented to the Association of Virginia Colleges, February 25, 1966.

5. Rosenfeld, Albert, "Will Man Direct His Own Evolution?" as quoted in Fabun, Don, The Dynamics of Change (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), Part VI, p. 21.

6. Two-Year Agreement Between the Board of Junior College District No. 508, County of Cook and State of Illinois and The Cook County College Teachers Union, Local 1600, A.F.T., May 3, 1967.

7. In a recent discussion of university programs and cooperative efforts among institutions, Tschirgi referred to this distinction in the following way: "Academic planning should be directed toward defining the boundaries of permissivity rather than attempting to be directional." In The Future of Biology (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1966), p. 110.

8. In his recent book, Thompson argues that uncertainty is the key problem facing complex organizations. He attempts to combine the advantages of both the "rational" and "natural systems" models of organization. Cf., Thompson, James D., Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), pp. 4-13, 159-163.

9. Kornhauser, William, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accomodation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963).

10. Corson states that the college or university has much in common with other groups: it exists to accomplish things since it has a purpose or purposes; it must have resources; it must have processes that facilitate men and women working together to accomplish a purpose; and as the enterprise moves on--it grows or it retrogresses. On the other hand, the college or university differs from other forms of enterprise on three bases: colleges and, to a still greater degree, universities exist to serve a multiplicity of purposes; the college, and to a lesser extent the university, is more dispersed as an enterprise than the typical enterprise or governmental agency; and, the responsibility for making decisions is more widely diffused. Corson, John J., Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 8-10.

11. Lunsford, Terry F., "Authority and Ideology in the Administered University," The American Behavioral Scientist (May, 1968), p. 6.

12. Wilensky, Harold L., Organizational Intelligence (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), pp. 10-16.

13. Report of the Select Committee on the Future of Private and Independent Higher Education in New York State, New York State and Private Higher Education (Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1968), pp. 55-56.

14. Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, The Culture of the University: Governance and Education (University of California, January 15, 1968), p. 31.

15. American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and American Association of Governing Boards, "A Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1966), pp. 3-14.

16. Selznick, Philip, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957), pp. 144. Also, see Chapter III for a discussion of mission and role and pp. 61-64 for a discussion of the functions of institutional leadership.

17. Thompson, James D. and McEwen, William J., "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, (February, 1958), p. 24.

18. Corson, op. cit., p. 11.

19. Clark, Burton R., "The Role of Faculty in College Administration," in Studies of College Faculty (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1961), p. 99.

20. Abbott, Frank, "Critique: The Role of Faculty in College Administration," in Studies of College Faculty (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1961) p. 105. The most recent statement supporting this position can be found in American Association for Higher Education, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (Washington, D.C., AAHE, 1967).

21. Pifer, Alan, "Toward a Coherent Set of National Policies for Higher Education," Liberal Education, (March, 1968), pp. 8-9.

22. Pifer, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

23. Hitch, Charles J., "The Systems Approach to Decision-Making in Defense and Universities," paper presented at the 1967 Conference of the Operational Research Society, The University of Exeter, September 28, 1968, p. 12.

24. Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Criteria for Evaluation in Planning State and Local Programs (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 26-27.

25. Joint Committee on Higher Education, The Academic State (Sacramento: California Legislature, 1968), p. 5.

26. In a recent but brief discussion of assessing educational output, Coombs suggests that "it should become increasingly feasible to measure the inputs and outputs of various sub-systems and objectives within an educational system and perhaps some day even a larger aggregate of these for a whole system." Philip H. Coombs, "What Do We Still Need To Know About Educational Planning?" Chapter Three in Bereday and Lauwerys, op. cit.

27. Glenny, Lyman A., "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," in Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State, W. John Minter (ed.), (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), pp. 27-46.

28. Wattenbarger, op. cit., p. 51.

29. Medsker, Leland L. and Clark, George W., State Level Governance of California Junior Colleges (Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, August, 1966), p. 18.

30. Medsker and Clark, op. cit., p. 20.

31. Ibid.

32. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 6, 158-163.

33. Crozier, Michel, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 111.

34. Selznick, Philip, The Organizational Weapon (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), p. 308.

35. Selznick, op. cit., p. 276.

36. Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 29-31.

37. Report of the Select Committee on Education, Education at Berkeley (Academic Senate, University of California, Berkeley, March, 1966); Report of the Committee on Academic Innovation and Development (Academic Senate, University of California, Los Angeles, November, 1967); and Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, op. cit.

38. Bennis, Warren G., Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 82.

39. Palola, Ernest G. Lehmann, Timothy, and Blischke, William R., "The Reluctant Planner: The Role of Faculty in Institutional Planning," in the Association for Institutional Research Annual Proceedings, 1968.

40. Ibid.